(2)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 16 2004
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.03-1227

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se- PETITIONER

VS

USPTO/BPAI Solicitor-RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

IN RE PO KEE WONG
FOR CASE 03-1322 (SERIAL No.08/980,657)

PETITION FOR REHEARING

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se-PETITIONER
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
Tel: 301-585-3453; E-mail: pokwong@rcn.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING: from page No. 1 to No.4

REFERENCES; from page No. 4 to page No. 5

CONCLUSION; page No. 6

CERTIFICATE: page No. 7

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING

I. **The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on the Supreme Court Rule 10-(a), (b), (c) that had been abused both by the Court of USPTO together with the U.S. Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit such that both Courts are possibly considered in violation of the meaning of 18 U.S.C. Section 2071:**

The Supreme Court Rule 10 is quoted in the following:

(a) a United States court of appeals has entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another United States court of appeals on the same matter; has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power;

(b) a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals;

(c) a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.

A petition for a writ of certiorari is rarely granted when the asserted error consists of erroneous factual findings or the misapplication of a properly stated rule of law.

---

18 U.S.C. Section 2071 provides:

Concealment, removal, or mutilation generally

(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with.... any public office, or with any....public officer of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

(b) Whoever, has the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States.

According to the supreme Court rule 10-(a),(b),(c) and the 18 U.S.C. Section 2071 being quoted from the above, since there are no conflicts between the USPTO Court and the U.S. Court of Appeal for the Federal Circuit about the Case 03-1227, therefore, the U.S. Supreme Court has decided not to grant the Writ of Certiorari for the Case 03-1227. However, the U.S. Supreme Court will be blamed by the general public in the United States for the implication of 18 U.S.C. Section 2071 altogether with its two lower Courts as so CLEARLY indicated by the question having been presented in the PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 03-1322 (SERIAL No. 08/980,657).

II. The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on the Supreme Court Rule 11. because that the case is imperative public importance to NASA Space Reentry Vehicle Programs; DOD Missile Targeting Programs; NRC New Nuclear Safety Standard Computer Development Program; NSF and DOE Educational Programs; NIST Science and Technology Standard Programs:

As indicated in the booklet **ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI** from page No. 3 to page No. 4, there are 8 reasons listed from page No. SA0039 to page No. SA0045 (7 pages) in the **BRIEF AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX FOR APPELLEE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.** The number 8th reason is relevant to many programs of U.S. National Interests based on the needs of each of the U.S. Agencies ' dependence on the accuracy of computers and calculators. The case 03-1227 provides a unique correction of the calculating procedures that have been prevailingly used in all computers and calculators for several decades in the past. This correction must be made, based on the impacts of the computers and calculators have been extensively used in various fields of sciences, engineering, technologies and mathematics in all U.S. governmental programs.

REFERENCES

All documents that have been filed with the U.S. Patent Application No. 08/980,657 by Po Kee Wong since 1995 can be traced from the following references:

(1) IMECE2003-43540 paper entitled " THE UNIQUELY-CORRECTED METHOD TO COMPUTE HIGH POWER FUNCTIONS." Accepted for presentation and publication at the 2003 ASME INTERNATIONAL MECHNAICAL ENGINEERING CONGRESS AND R&D EXPO

(2) PROCEEDINGS, November 15-21, 2003, Washington DC USA.

(3) Re: "TI an order of operation." by many authors can be obtained from Website: http://www.mathforum.com/epigone/math-teach/thilvarkhax

(4) " Thanks to Professor Rosa's Reply to " TI an order of operations by Sussan More." By Po Kee Wong." By Po Kee Wong from Website:http://www.mathforum.com/epigone/math-teach/thilvarkhax/ai24cvayop6y@legacy

(5) http://mathforum.org/epigone/geometry-research/cloosnerdphee/4gvqblzeprlw@legacy

(6) http://mathforum.org/epigone/geometry-research/cloosnerdphee/0dvmfpecqq13@legacy

(7) http://mathforum.org/epigone/geometry-research/cloosnerdphee/f0k3t99bp17x@legacy

(8) Typing the name of Po Kee Wong into the search query of the following 3 Websites, the first few of the top 20 searches will show the information about the IMECE 2003-43540 paper relevant to Case 03-1227:

(9) www.yahoo.com

(10) www.netscape.com

(11) www.msn.com

(12) Typing patent Numbers 5,084,232; 5,848,377 and 6,430,516 into the query of http://164.195.100.11/netahtml/srchnum.htm.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above reasons and from the public opinions shown in the references, the petition for rehearing should be granted.

CERTIFICATE

I certify pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.2 that this petition for rehearing is restricted to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented, and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Respectfully submitted to the United States Supreme Court by:

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner
2413 Spencer Road
Silver Spring , Maryland 20910-2344
Tel: 301-585-3453
E-mail:pokwong@rcn.com